

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington. D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/075,218	02/14/2002	Thomas S. Kobayashi	SC11931TP	8301	
23125	7590 01/21/2003				
MOTORO	MOTOROLA INC			EXAMINER	
AUSTIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW SECTION			FARAHANI, DANA		
7700 WEST AUSTIN, T	PARMER LANE MD: X 78729	TX32/PL02	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,	. ,		2814	2814	
			DATE MAIL ED: 01/21/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

>	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/075,218	KOBAYASHI ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Dana Farahani	2814				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 02 January 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>						
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
<ul><li>(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9, 11-18, and 20</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8.☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☑ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						
10. Other:						
	SULL FIZEO DY TECHNOLO	COST DENVISOR DEN				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: lee's substrate, in fact, could be, preferably, an insulating substrate. This is because the circuitry 811 and 812 would have been insulated from each other. Note that they are insulated from each other by insulator 804..